DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 214 CE 079 961

TITLE	Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN) Staff Development through Five Regional Staff Development Centers. Final Report, July 1998-June 1999.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., McKeesport.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.; Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Div. of Adult Basic and Literacy Education Programs.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	53p.; For the PA-ARN Action Research Monographs connected to this project, see CE 079 962-985. Project Director was Gary W. Kuhne. For the 1997-1998 final report, see ED 427 221.
CONTRACT	099-99-9010
AVAILABLE FROM	AdvancE, PDE Resource Center, Department of Education, 333 Market Street, Floor 11, Harrisburg PA 17126-0333. Tel: 717-783-6788; Web site: http://www.pde.psu.edu/able.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Action Research; Adult Basic Education; *Adult Educators; Adult Literacy; English (Second Language); High School Equivalency Programs; *Literacy Education; Material Development; *Problem Solving; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; State Programs; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

With the existence of 67 monographs and approximately 60 practitioners trained in action research in the western and central parts of Pennsylvania from project years 1995-98, the 1998-99 Section 353 project expanded the action research network (ARN) to include teachers, administrators, and researchers in the northeastern and southeastern parts of the state. The project produced a revision of the monograph guidelines and the Action Research Planner (ARP); trained 23 participants over the approximately 8-month research period; continued the refinement of the proposal review process to allow expert input to project proposal designs in order to improve quality control; produced 23 research monographs; and developed the Learning from Practice Web page (http://www.learningfrompractice.org). Interviews with 15 of 20 1997-98 participants one year after the completion of their project activities found: the majority improved their problem solving strategies; dealt with problems more systematically; made lasting changes in their classrooms; and felt action research made changes in their agencies. Interviews with 10 of 16 supervisors of participants' programs found that they rated action research highly, and a majority pointed to lasting changes in their institutions/programs as a result of action research. The 8-page report is followed by a list of 1998-99 monograph titles, the results of evaluation studies of the Pennsylvania ARN, and revisions to the ARP and Monograph Guide. (Contains 53 references.) (YLB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 214

FINAL REPORT

**"Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN)
Staff Development Through Five Regional Staff Development Centers"**

**Project Number 099-99-9010
July 1998—June 1999**

**Project Director: Dr. Gary W. Kuhne
Assistant Professor and Regional Director of Adult Education
The Pennsylvania State University**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE079961

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TITLE PAGE

Title: Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN) Staff Development Through Five Regional Staff Development Centers

Project Director: Dr. Gary W. Kuhne, Assistant Professor and Regional Director of Adult Education, The Pennsylvania State University

Fiscal Year: 1998-1999

Agency Address: Pennsylvania Action Research Network
Penn State-McKeesport,
307 Ostermayer Lab
McKeesport, PA 15132-7698

Federal Funding Awarded: $46,539

Project No: 099-99-9010

The activity, which is the subject of this report, was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT PAGE	iv
INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT	1
FINAL REPORT	3
Statement of the Problem	3
Goals and Objectives of the Project	3
Procedures Employed	5
Objectives Met	5
Objectives Not Met	6
Evaluation Instruments and Results	6
Procedure for the Dissemination of Findings and Products	8
Recommendations	8
BIBLIOGRAPHY ON ACTION RESEARCH	9
APPENDIX A: 1998-99 MONOGRAPH TITLES	13
APPENDIX B: EVALUATION STUDIES OF PAARN	15
External Evaluation	16
Impact Evaluation of Supervisors of Participants in 1997-98 Projects	18
Impact Evaluation of Participants in 1997-98 Projects	22
Field Evaluation of 1998-99 Participants	28
APPENDIX C: REVISIONS	36
• Revisions to the Action Research Planner	
• Revisions to the Monograph Guide	

ABSTRACT PAGE **Project No.: 099-99-9010**

Grant Recipient: Pennsylvania Action Research Network: c/o Penn State-McKeesport 307 Ostermayer Lab, McKeesport, PA 15132-7698 Phone: 412-675-9473
Program Name: Pennsylvania Action Research Network (PA-ARN) Staff Development Through Five Regional Staff Development Centers
Grant Allocation: $46,539
Project Period: July 1998-June 1999
Project Director: Dr. Gary W. Kuhne, Assistant Professor and Regional Director of Adult Education, The Pennsylvania State University
Project Purpose: The project proposed to (a) train & mentor literacy/ABE/GED/ESL practitioners in Pennsylvania in action research, (b) extend the development of the Action Research Network begun in 1995/96 across more of Pennsylvania, and (c) produce and disseminate practitioner-based knowledge for the advancement of the field.
Project Outcomes: The project produced the following outcomes: (a) a revision of the monograph guidelines and the Action Research Planner, (b) trained 23 participants over the approximately eight-month research period, (c) continued refinement the proposal review process to allow expert input to project proposal designs to improve quality control, (d) produced 23 research monographs, (e) conducted an impact study on those who participated in 1997-98 as well as their '97-'98 supervisors, (f) conducted an annual meeting of participants and interested others at the 1998 PAACE conference, (g) conducted a participant follow-up evaluation among the 1998-1999 participants, and (h) planned for moving Action Research training into the PAARN Summer Institute for 1999-2000 project year.
Impact: Impact evaluation was done with both participants from the 1997-98 project year, as well as supervisors of participants. Participant impact interviews were conducted with 15/20 of the 1997-98 action research participants between March-April, 1999 (one year after their involvement with the Network) with the following findings: (a) the majority (93%) of last year's participants as interviewed had improved their problem solving strategies, (b) the majority (93%) now deal with problems more systematically, (c) the majority (60%) had made lasting changes in their classrooms, and (d) the majority (67%) felt action research had made changes in their agencies. Supervisor interviews were conducted with 10/16 of the supervisors of the participants' programs with the following findings: (a) supervisors rated action research highly; and (b) the majority (80%) could point to lasting changes in their institutions and/or programs as a result of action research. Summative evaluation was done with the current year's participants (1998-99) and found that participants were very satisfied with their involvement in 1998-99 projects and had made meaningful changes to their programs as a result of action research.
Products: PAARN produced 23 trained practitioners, 23 monographs of completed projects, contributed to the development of better dissemination of findings through the development of the Learning from Practice Web page, a revised monograph guideline and Action Research Planner, an impact study on the '97 -'98 participants and their supervisors, and a follow-up evaluation of this year's participants.
Products Available From: Products are available from AdvancE, contacting PDC offices, or by contacting the Pennsylvania Action Research Network.
Project Continuation and/or Future Implications: The positive picture of project impacts suggests Action Research should continue as an important form of professional staff development within the state.
Conclusions/Recommendations: In coordination with the Department of Education, a more comprehensive plan for the dissemination of research findings must be developed. The Action Research Network needs to continue to draw out patterns of findings and better disseminate these in ways the field can use. In addition, PDE should consider ways to use the Action Research Network to test new policy ideas or program thrusts. Finally, the emergent directions of practitioner interests and research could also be used to inform PDE policy.

INTRODUCTION TO THE 1998-99 FINAL REPORT

Project Purposes: The purposes of this project could be described as a professional development "process" for improving practice at the individual and local level, and the development of a knowledge "product" for the improvement of literacy at the state (and national) level. Specifically, the two basic purposes of this project were:

(1) To continue to supplement the traditional professional staff development model being used in Pennsylvania by adding a practitioner-based model of action research and (with an added objective) to compare the lasting impact of action research with traditional workshops/courses in the literacy field.

(2) To add practice-based knowledge to the knowledge base and literature as created by practitioners.

Project Time Frame and Activities Overview: Projects in 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98 were carried out in the Northwest region, the Southwest region, the South Central region, and the Central Northwest region. The 1998-99 extension of this project expanded into the Southeast region, as well as continued professional staff development efforts in the four regions already impacted. The delivery model used involved practitioners meeting regularly--from weekly to BI-weekly--for several hours at a central location in a region for both the training and on-going meetings on projects. In addition to the meetings, participants had frequent contact by telephone/mail or e-mail with their group leader from the Action Research team.

Key Personnel: The Action Research team included:

Research Director:	Dr. Gary W. Kuhne, Penn State University
Admin. Assistant:	Debbie Doyle
Team Leader for Pittsburgh and PDC Southwest:	Hedy Miller
Team Leader for Erie and PDC Northwest:	David Fetterman
Team Leader for PDC Central/Northeast:	David Fetterman
Team Leader for the PDC Southeast	David Fetterman
Team Leader for PDC South Central:	Linda Ritchie

Audience: The specific audience for this project was literacy, ABE, GED, and ESL practitioners in Pennsylvania. Administrators, teachers, program planners, and counselors would find the report useful for ideas on various interventions that hold promise to solve practice-based problems. An impact study was conducted on the participants and the supervisors of their programs of 1997-98. The results of the projects as published in the 1998-99 monographs (23 new monographs, added to the 67 written over the past three years for a total of 90) will also be of interest to researchers. Permanent copies of monographs are available at the AdvancE library in Harrisburg and also at the Western Pennsylvania Adult Literacy Resource Center in Harrisburg (addresses below), in PDF format through the Learning From Practice Website, and on request from the Action Research Network:

Overview of Outcomes. Each action research project conformed to quality control standards set by the Handbook. In addition, a panel of three experts reviewed participants' initial planning designs for projects in order to give further input. Each of the 23 completed projects for 1998-99 has been made available in a monograph form for distribution through AdvancE and by the Action Research Network (see Appendix A for monograph titles). Monographs in PDF formats are available through the Learning From Practice Website. An open mid-year meeting was hosted at the annual Pennsylvania Adult Education conference in Hershey, PA.

Report Copies can be attained from:

AdvancE, PDE Resource Center
Dept. Of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Information on the Project can be attained from:

Dr. Gary Kuhne:	ph. 412-675-9473
Debbie Doyle:	ph. 724-727-2518

Mailing Address.

Pennsylvania Action Research Network
c/o Adult Education Graduate Program
Penn State University, McKeesport Campus
307 Ostermayer Lab
McKeesport, PA. 15132

Comment: Concerning the Nature of the Monographs

A "qualifier" has been inserted in the inside cover of each monograph which states that none of the individual reports assumes to hold wide generalizability; rather, each of these small-scale studies is strictly illustrative, informative and--hopefully --stimulative for other practitioners who might choose to replicate or adapt study to their setting. This qualifier has been added because those who are not knowledgeable about action research might assume that these are quantitative parametric experimental studies with wide generalizability. Quite the contrary, Action research adds pieces of a puzzle and any generalizability sought can be gained by seeking patterns of findings over time. Thus, the qualifier asks readers to look at other similar monographs as well as the literacy literature for patterns or; alternatively, to contact the Action Research Network team for assistance in this. Summaries of such patterns are currently being studied and the results will be available through the Learning From Practice Website.

FINAL REPORT: PAARN 1998-99

Statement of the Problem

The Action Research initiative in Pennsylvania was rooted in a literature review demonstrating a growing awareness in K-12 (as well as in Adult Basic Education) that **"expert research" or "received research" is not the entire answer to everyday practitioner problems**. While the field of literacy does not lack "received research" (including 353 research), practitioners lack ways to systematically apply expert findings; to observe and validate the outcomes of their own work; and, too often, the confidence to share their knowledge widely (Lytle & Cochran-Smith, 1990). As a result, the field does not develop or apply expert knowledge well, nor does it inform itself very well from its own practice.

Traditional school-oriented workshops and courses are perhaps the most extensively used form of professional development in both K-12 and adult basic education, but have **demonstrated important limitations** for the professional development of literacy practitioners, including:

(1) The geography for delivery of workshops is often problematic.

(2) The travel costs are usually a barrier for practitioners.

(3) The disincentive of knowing that very few practitioners will realize any career advancement/pay raise by virtue of traveling and attending "professional development".

(4) The constant problem of real content relevance in workshops and courses.

(5) The difficulty with on-going mentoring or follow-up of traditional school-oriented professional development workshop/course.

Awareness of the problems with traditional school-oriented professional development workshops and courses has led many to suggest that the answer to improved professional practice lies in **self-directed learning by literacy practitioners**. Although self-directed learning activities can produce useful results for practitioners, there are a number of weaknesses at the every day operational level when relying too heavily upon such an answer. A better and more complete answer requires that practitioners be given:

(1) A better method for taking published research findings and testing, then adapting them, in their own classrooms.

(2) A way to systematically study their own research ideas on a daily-action basis.

(3) A systematic way to share and disseminate findings of best practices so improvements to teaching/administration/counseling do not need to be constantly "rediscovered" across the state and country.

Seeking to respond to the above listed problems and limitations of workshops and independent studies, many adult literacy programs across California, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia have begun using Action Research. The Pennsylvania Action Research Network has completed three years of increasingly productive professional development assistance

within the state. The long-term impact studies conducted in this project (see Appendix B) and the participant evaluation follow up study (see Appendix B) strongly suggest that action research is helping to address some of the endemic issues of traditional professional development and limitations of self-directed practitioner improvement.

Goals and Objectives of the Project

This proposal sought to add Pennsylvania's staff development efforts the dimension of "doing by learning," as action research's acknowledged founder Kurt Lewin described the working definition of action research. With the existence of 67 monographs and approximately 60 trained practitioners in the western and central parts of the state from project years 1995-98, this year's project sought to expand the network to include teachers, administrators, and researchers in the northeastern and southeastern parts of the state. It was hoped that practitioners could be linked throughout the state in order to provide a means to work together on common problems statewide. The focus of all action research projects was on everyday program and classroom needs. A number of goals guided the actual implementation of this 1998-99 353 project:

1. **Serve New Areas:** We will continue action research staff development in the Southwest (Pittsburgh), the Northwest (Erie), the Central Northeast (2 groups, one near Scranton and one near Lockhaven), and the South Central (Lewistown), and expand into the Southeast (Lancaster). We expect to have a total of 40 new participants this year.

2. **Employ A Consistent Training Model:** An Action research Staff Developer will be assigned for each PDC region (two for the Central Northwest) to meet a minimum of eight times with participants in PA-ARN for half day training - facilitation sessions (once in September, Bi-weekly in October and November, Once in January, February, March, - more as needed). These half-day sessions will provide continuing guidance and facilitation during implementation of action research projects.

3. **Develop A Summer PAARN Institute**: The principle investigator will develop a Summer Action Research Institute for use in future years (Summer 1999 will be target date for first Summer Action Research Institute). This Summer Action Research Institute will enable PA-ARN to centralize the Action Research Training process. Potential action research participants for the upcoming year from various regions of the state would attend the Institute and receive basic instruction in Action Research, assistance in developing their actual action research proposal, and both an evaluation review of their proposed projects and formal approval before the end of the Institute. Moving from training in each region into an Institute approach will insure uniformity in training, allow new projects to begin in September of each year instead of months later, incorporate the evaluation process into beginning of year, and permit more cross-region sharing by participants on the action research process.

4. **Expand The Monograph Series**: PA-ARN will plan to continue the edited monograph series, as well as collaborate with the individual or team established by ABLE to coordinate the dissemination of research findings from the Learning From Practice projects. Debbie Doyle will maintain the database and Issues Network and edit the final monographs. Dr. Kuhne will act as managing editor on all products.

5. **Disseminate Sound Research Findings:** Participation in PA-ARN will be voluntary. The team's job will be to advise on, coordinate, and help disseminate sound research. The team will ultimately reserve the right not to edit a piece in the monograph series. That researcher can provide a report to PDE in another format, as necessary. The

team will advise all participants on the protection of human subjects but will not take liability for breaches of subject confidentiality. It will be explained to those who inquire that this project can only serve practitioners who are under PDE-Sponsored program auspices.

6. Coordinate with Project Equal: PA-ARN will seek to coordinate with Project Equal initiatives in various regions to develop joint efforts as appropriate.

Procedures Employed

This project was conducted from July 1, 1998 - June 30, 1999 in five different locations within the PDC regions mentioned above. Team leaders (Hedy Miller, Dave Fetterman, Linda Ritchie) conducted bi-weekly/monthly meetings. The team also made presentations on action research at the PAACE annual conference. Adult basic education, literacy, GED, ESL teachers, tutors, program administrators, and counselors became involved from large urban, smaller urban, and rural programs.

Every participant was trained using the revised Handbook and Planner and, where possible, a mentor from the 1995-98 project years was involved in the training and mentoring of new participants. The participants also received frequent follow up calls from our team leaders. Learning from previous year's experience, practitioners in rural areas were served by action researcher team trainers/mentors with monthly daylong meetings. For urban areas, (e.g., in Pittsburgh) participants began with weekly meetings and moved to meetings every second week. Rural practitioners, especially, were encouraged to establish "buddies" within their groups. A panel of 3 experts was asked to review each initial planner from each practitioner in the early stages of projects. The panel gave individual feedback. The Project Director was the coordinating point and he synthesized the feedback for each practitioner. It is evident that this external level of input has enhanced the monographs over this last year

Objectives Met And How

• **Serve New Areas:** We were able to engage 23 practitioners in all five regions, i.e., the Southwest, the Northwest, the Central Northeast, the South Central, and the Southeast regions. Thus we met the regional expansion goals identified at the start of the project year.

• **Employ A Consistent Training Model:** The Pennsylvania Action Research Handbook & Project Planner, first written by A. Quigley in 1995-96, received minor revisions based on input from past years. This was used in all of the training sessions and was disseminated to the participants. The planner formed the basis for each project and only when this planner was acceptably complete and reviewed by the team leader and the expert panel was an individual's project begun. The Network team was oriented for this year at an initial fall meeting and, as described above, they met with interested practitioners in rural and urban settings as described. The evaluation of their training and the projects overall can be seen in the evaluations. An Action research Staff Developer was assigned for each PDC region to meet a minimum of eight times with participants in PA-ARN for half day training - facilitation sessions (once in September, Bi-weekly in October and November, Once in January, February, March, - more as needed). These half-day sessions provided continuing guidance and facilitation during implementation of action research projects.

• **Develop A Summer PAARN Institute**: The principle investigator developed a Summer Action Research Institute to be held on August 16-18, 1999. This Summer Action Research Institute will enable PA-ARN to centralize the Action Research Training process. Potential action

research participants for the upcoming year from various regions of the state will attend the Institute and receive basic instruction in Action Research, assistance in developing their actual action research proposal, and both an evaluation review of their proposed projects and formal approval before the end of the Institute. Moving from training in each region into an Institute approach will insure uniformity in training, allow new projects to begin in September of each year instead of months later, incorporate the evaluation process into beginning of year, and permit more cross-region sharing by participants on the action research process.

• **Expand The Monograph Series**. 23 monographs were completed (Appendices A) and many participants said on their evaluations that they would continue with further cycles of the project and new projects using action research. A panel of 3 experts reviewed each initial planner from each practitioner in the early stages of projects. The panel gave individual feedback. The Project Director coordinated the review and synthesized the feedback for each practitioner. It was evident that this external level of input enhanced the monographs.

• **Disseminate Sound Research Findings:** The PAARN team helped the participants develop sound research through advising, coordinating, and helping to disseminate sound research. The team reserved the right not to edit a piece in the monograph series if the project does not meet quality control standards. The team advised all participants on the protection of human subjects.

• **Annual Meeting**: The Action Research team presented a synopsis of the results from this year at the workshop entitled "Learning From Practice" at the 1999 annual PAACE Conference in Hershey PA.

Objectives Not Met And Why

• **Number of Participants:** We expected to have a total of 40 new participants this year. PAARN was only able to recruit 23 participants and 23 complete monographs. The main reasons voiced by potential participants for not getting involved included:

1. PALPIN, a project with a similar set of process goals based out of Philadelphia inadvertently recruited from the same pool of practitioners. PALPIN held a winter institute in Philadelphia, which recruited across the entire state and into the regions being served by PA-ARN, reducing the population base and amount of funding for practitioners at the local level.

2. The practitioners found many competing time demands in other state and regional efforts.

3. The need for practitioners to be involved in Project Equal created yet another competition for already busy people.

• **Coordinate with Project Equal:** Conflicting schedules made coordination difficult with Project Equal. It is hoped that more active coordination can occur in the upcoming year.

Evaluation Instrument and Results

A comprehensive program evaluation was carried out over the project year utilizing four tools including (a) an impact evaluation with participants from the previous year, (b) an impact evaluation with supervisors of participants from the previous year, (c) an evaluation of current participants, and (d) an external evaluation report from an expert in action research. The specific

findins follow for each of these evaluation initiatives. The full results of each of these evaluation efforts are found in Appendix B.

• **Results From The Impact Evaluation With Past Participants**:

Impact evaluation was done with both participants from the 1997-98 project year. Participant impact interviews were conducted with 15/20 of the 1997-98 action research participants between March-April, 1999 (one year after their involvement with the Network) with the following finding:

1. The majority (93%) of last year's participants as interviewed had improved their problem solving strategies.

2. The majority (93%) now deal with problems more systematically.

3. The majority (67%) had made lasting changes in their classrooms.

4. The majority (40%) felt action research had made lasting changes in their agencies.

• **Results From The Impact Evaluation With Supervisors**:

Supervisor interviews were conducted with 10/16 of the supervisors of the 1997-98 participants' programs with the following finding:

1. Supervisors rated action research highly.

2. Supervisors wanted up to 100% of their staff trained in it.

3. The majority (80%) could point to lasting changes to their institutions and/or programs as a result of action research.

• **Results From The Evaluation Of Current Participants**:

Summative evaluation was done with 13/21 of the current year's participants (1998-99) with the following findings:

1. 85% were satisfied with the training they received.

2. 92% were satisfied with how the trainers conducted the meetings and the support they received from the leader.

3. 85% felt action research was a valuable way to resolve practice problems and add new knowledge to the field.

4. 93% felt the action research process was useful in dealing with problems.

5. 100% felt action research was helpful to their work.

• **External Expert Evaluation**:

An external evaluation was contracted with Dr. B. Allan Quigley from St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia, Canada, a recognized international expert on Action Research and Literacy. The primary findings are as follows:

1. PA-ARN projects are becoming more substantive in the issues they address - probably because of the double-blind review process.

2. The outcomes are making a consistent impact on individual practice, on programs, and on agency effectiveness.

3. When compared with the alternatives for professional development and creation of shared knowledge, the PA-ARN project is much more successful than its alternatives, such as workshops.

4. Pennsylvania PA-ARN project is a model of successful operation and productivity.

Procedure for the Dissemination of Findings and Products:

The products are available through AdvancE and the Network. In addition, the abstracts of monographs and summaries of findings are available for searching at the Learning From Practice (LFP) Website. Over the next year it is planned to have the full monographs available for downloading in PDF files from the LFP Website. The actual process and model are described more fully in a book from Jossey-Bass Publisher: Creating Practical Knowledge: Posing Problems, Solving Problems, and Improving Daily Practice, edited by Dr. A. Quigley and Dr. G. Kuhne with contributing chapters from various team members and a critique by Professor John Peters of the University of Tennessee. It is hoped that the new knowledge, the impact study, and the PA process will all be written about in adult education journals in the coming years.

Recommendations:

The fruitful outcomes from this year's project argue strongly for the continued use of action research as a professional development option within the state. The need for better forms of dissemination suggests that dissemination policy development become a priority in the upcoming year. Finally, the use of action research within the state has created a national (and international) interest in Pennsylvania's approach to staff development for adult basic and literacy practitioners, an interest that confirms the bureau's "cutting edge" position in the field. Building on this momentum by continued action research initiatives would continue to enhance the reputation of the adult education practice within Pennsylvania.

BIBLIOGRAPHY RELEVANT TO ACTION RESEARCH

Apps, G. (1979). Lifelong learning: Problems in research. In J. Niemi (Ed.). Viewpoints on adult education research, pp. 1-14. Information Series no. 171. Columbus, The Ohio State University: ERIC Clearing on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Argyris, C. (1989). Reasoning, learning and action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1974). Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boshier, R. (1994). Initiating research. In R. Garrison (Ed.), Research Perspectives in adult education, pp. 73-116. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Co.

Bryant, I., & Usher, R. (1986, June). Tension points in adult education research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Standing Committee of University Teaching and Research in the Education of Adults, University of Hull, Hull: England.

Catelli, L. (1995). Action research and collaborative inquiry in a school-university partnership. Action in Teacher Education, 16(4), 25-38.

Clift, R., Veal, ML., Johnson, M., & Holland, P. (1990). Restructuring teacher education thorough collaborative action research. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (2), 52-62.

Cervero, R. (1991). Changing relationships between theory and practice. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study, pp. 19-41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cockley, S. (1993). The adult educator's guide to practitioner research. Dayton, VA: The Virginia Adult Educators Research Network.

Costanza, A. (1991). Participatory action research: A view from the ACTWU. In W. F. Whyte (Ed.), Participatory action research, pp. 70-76. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Deshler, D. (1991) - Social, professional and academic issues. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study. pp. 384-420. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deshler, D. & Hagan, N. (1989). Adult education research. In S. Merriam & P. Cunningham (Eds.), Handbook of adult and continuing education, pp. 147-167. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fernandes, W. & Tandon, R. (1961). Participatory research and evaluation: Experiments in research as a process of liberation. New Delhi, India: Indian Social Institute.

Garrison, R. & Shale, D. (1994). Methodological issues: Philosophical differences and complementary methodologies. In R. Garrison (Ed.). Research perspectives in adult education. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Co.

Gaventa, J. & Horton, M. (1981). A citizens research project in Appalachia, USA. Convergence, 14, 30-42.

Guba, Y.. & Lincoln, Y. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, B. (1979). Participatory research: Breaking the academic monopoly. In J. Niemi (Ed.). Viewpoints on adult education research, pp. 43-70. Information Series no. 171. Columbus, The Ohio State University: ERIC Clearing on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Hall, H.; Gillette, A.; Tandon, R. (1982). Creating knowledge: A monopoly? Participatory research in development. Participatory Research Network Series no. 1. Toronto: International Council for Adult Education.

Horton, D. (1991). Social scientists in international agricultural research: Ensuring relevance and contributing to the knowledge base. Participatory action research, pp. 218~236. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Joyce, B. (1969). Alternative models of elementary education. Waltham, MA: Xerox College Publishing.

Joyce, B. (1972). The teacher innovator: A program for preparing teachers. In B. Joyce & M. Weil (Eds.), Perspectives for reform in teacher education (pp. 4. 22). Englewoods Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kember, D. & Gow, L. (1992). Action research as a form of staff development in higher education. Higher Education, 23, 297-310.

Kemmis, S. (1991). Improving education through action research. In 0. Zuber-Skerritt (Ed.), Action research for change and development. Brookfield, VT: Gower Publishing.

Kemmis, S. & MacTaggart, R. (Eds.) (1988). The action research planner, 3rd edition. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Kyle, D. & Hovda, R. (1987). Action research: Comments in current trends and future possibilities. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(3), 170-175.

Lowe, J. (1975). The education of adults: A world Perspective. (2nd ed.) Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lytle, S & Cochran-Smith, M. (1990) Learning from teacher research: A working typology. Teachers College Record, 92, (1). pp. 83-103.

McDonald, B. (1994, winter). Director's column. The Community Exchange, 3(2), p. 2.

McTaggart, R. (1991). Principles for participatory action research. Adult Education quarterly, 3(41), 168-187.

Merriam, S. (1991). How research produces knowledge. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study. pp. 42-65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S & Simpson, E. (1984) - A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing.

Nixon, J. (1987). The teacher as researcher: Contradictions and continuities. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(2), 20-32.

Okunrotifa, P. (1971). Curriculum improvement through action research. In Teacher Education in New Countries, 12 (2), 153 - 16.

Pace, L. & Argona, D. (1991). Participatory actin research: A view from Xerox. In W. F. Whyte (Ed.), Participatory action research, pp. 56-69. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pates, A. (1992). Collaborative research in ABE. Vision, 4(2), 1,3-4.

Peters, J. (1991). Advancing the study of adult education. In J. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.). Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study. pp. 384-420. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peters, M. & Robinson, V. (1984) - The origins and status of action research. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20(2), 113-124.

Quigley, A. (1995). Pennsylvania action research handbook and project planner. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Quigley, A., Dean, G. & Lawson, P. (1994). The protection of human subjects: Possibilities and problems in adult education research. In G. Dean and T. Ferro (Eds.). proceedings of the Pennsylvania adult and continuing education research conference, pp. 113-119. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Quigley, A. & Kuhne, G. (1997)(Eds.). Creating practical knowledge through action research: Posing problems, solving problems, and improving daily practice, New Directions in Adult and Continuing Education, no.73, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Shafer, C. (1995, December). Doing research with communities: Smart research that results in sustainable change. Innovations in Community and Rural Development. Ithaca: Cornell University, The Cornell PAR Network.

Staff. (1993). Exemplary Practice file: Adult literacy teacher, ABE, GED, & ESL, 2(4). New York Institute for Adult Development, New York.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). Introduction to curriculum research and development. London: Heinemann Education.

Taylor, E. (1993) Gatekeeping and the AEQ: An inside view. 34th Annual Adult Education Research Conference, pp.281-286. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.

Tom, A. & Sork, T. (1994). Issues in collaborative research. In R. Garrison (Ed.). I Researchers Directives in adult education. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Co.

Torbert, W. (1981). Why educational research has been so uneducational: The case for a new model of social science based on collaborative inquiry. In P. Reason and J. Rowan (Eds.), Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research. New York: Wiley, 1981.

van Manen, M. (1990). Beyond assumptions: Shifting the limits Theory into practice, 29(3), 153-157

Watkins, K. & Brooks, A. (1994). The emerging power of action inquiry technologies. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education Series no. 63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weisbord, H. (1987). Productive workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whitehead, J. (1989). How do we improve research-based professionalism in education? A question which includes action research, educational theory and the politics of educational knowledge. British Educational Journal, 15(1), pp. 3-17.

Whyte, W. (Ed.) (1991). Participatory action research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wilson, A. (1992). Science and the professionalization of American adult education:, 1934-1989: A study of knowledge development in the adult education handbooks. A. Blunt (Ed.), Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Adult Education Research Conference pp. 260-266. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.

APPENDIX A: 1998-99 MONOGRAPH TITLES

NOTE: Completed Monographs Are Enclosed With This Final Report

1. Anthony, Robert: Use of metacognitive teaching to enhance English language literacy of deaf and hard-of-hearing adult teachers.

2. Barton, Anne: Phonemic awareness education with an ESL class.

3. Corle, Daniel: Increased Tutor Participation.

4. Davis, Christina: Will the use of videos designed for the purpose of teaching English pronunciation improve the learners' production of discrete sounds by at least 80% over a 12 week period?

5. Edmonston, Ginny: Development of an IEP Form for adult students.

6. Elsberger. Barbara: Will parental incentives increase parental involvement?

7. Finn-Miller, Susan: Issues around teaching competencies in a family literacy program.

8. Frankenburger, Lydia: Contacting students to raise retention rates.

9. Jackson, Shirley: Teaching short-term and long-term goal-settings to ESL students for educational, personal, and career application.

10. Kline, Judy: Using communication to retain tutors.

11. Kriley, Pat: Peer vocabulary building teams.

12. Madgar, Eileen: Implementation of a procedure manual to improve teacher performance.

13. Matthews, Jeanette: Increasing student motivation through the development of a personal mission statement.

14. Mundie, Karen: Integrating professional teaching staff into a volunteer-based organization.

15. Nagel, Elaine: Making a choice between the TABE and the CASAS.

16. Roe, Stuart: Increasing positive outcomes in GED classes through family literacy programs.

17. Roles, Stacey: The benefits of a tutor training manual.

18. Schwartz-Hardiman, Sydney: Post-test learner evaluation.

19. Shenk, Timothy: Teaching grammar in an ESL classroom.

20. Snider, Sue: Developing an intense goal-setting portion of a student orientation: Helping students to focus on their goals and remain with GPLC until those goals are achieved.

21. Taylor, Valorie: One-size-fits-all vs. Pick-and-choose format.

22. Urey, Donna: Redesigning the current student tracking form.

23. Zangari, Lora: Conversation partners: work in progress.

APPENDIX B: 1998/99 EVALUATIONS

- EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT
- IMPACT EVALUATION: SUPERVISORS' INTERVIEWS
- IMPACT EVALUATION: PARTICIPANTS' INTERVIEWS
- PAARN FIELD EVALUATION 1998-99 COMMENTS

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

May 26, 1999

To Whom it May Concern:

Evaluation of the 1999 Pennsylvania Action Research Network

I have carefully reviewed four documents provided me by the PA-ARN Directors: 1) The 1999 Summary of Participant's Interview Responses as conducted by D. Doyle on projects completed in 1997-1998,2) the supporting data report for the participants' interviews, 3) The 1999 Summary of Supervisors' Interview Responses as conducted by D. Doyle on practitioners' projects completed in 1997-1998, and 4) the supporting data report for the supervisors' interviews.

It should first be noted that it is unusual for educational programs to conduct a follow-up evaluation a full year after participants complete a program or project. It is much more common to see evaluations conducted at the very end of the program or course of study. Research will show that ratings are almost invariably higher by conducting an evaluation immediately following a course or project. A full year after a project, as in this case, gives much more valid data and this should be noted as a strength of the PA-ARN 1999 evaluation study.

Having noted that 15 PA-ARN participants were interviewed one year after the completion of their project activities (conducted in 1997-1998), it is important to note that all participants had a post-secondary degree ranging from a Bachelor's degree to a PhD and the average for the group was 6.9 years in the literacy field. This would appear to be a strong participant group which should be able to make astute comments about their training and professional development.

Having reviewed the documentation, it is clear that the 1999 interview group was highly satisfied with the PA-ARN training and that they were also highly successful in making a difference for their teaching and their own program as a result of PA-ARN. A total of 60% made classroom changes, 67% saw program-wide changes, and 40% saw agency procedural changes as a result of their action research projects. On a personal level, 93% said they had better problem solving skills as a result of action research. Direct quotes from the participants comparing action research with traditional training workshops include the following: "With AR [action research] the benefits are that you put more time and more thought into work; it is a lot more personalized; more ownership." "I got to go deeper with AR; I benefit more because it pertains to my students. AR is more relevant to what I do; it reaches into my heart more than someone else's plan." "AR gives you strong tools to use." These unsolicited comments and others at least as positive not listed here indicate that the PA-ARN project in 1997-1998 was highly successful at the personal, classroom, program, and agency-wide levels.

Suggestions for the future from participants were supportive and constructive, including: "[get] access to other projects," "get more people involved," "[use] better publicity," "start sooner," "make changes to the monograph form."

The companion supervisors' report (with 10 participants involved in the evaluation interviews) also indicated strong support for the program. A total of 30% of the supervisors had conducted an action research project themselves and the average length of time they had been in their supervisory position was 10.7 years. Again, this would appear to be an exemplary group of supervisors for purposes of this follow-up evaluation.

Asked to compare AR with traditional workshops, 70% of the supervisors said there was an "attitude change" as a result of AR. Their comments included, "There is a bigger commitment to

program goals; there is more involvement in programs at regional and state levels; it forced networking with teachers." "They're better prepared in their teaching and more thorough; they spend more time thinking their particular job through before jumping in." "They have a sense of the larger picture, because of that they are able to problem-solve better." And, "People have gotten into the habit of using research."

A total of 80% said the PA-ARN projects made a difference to their institution and 60% said there has been an impact on the courses as a result. Comments included: "There is a commitment of staff to ask more questions in practice. . . Action Research changed their minds of what training was about." "The biggest impact is that the whole culture of continuous improvement changed."

Recommendations for the future were few from the supervisors. They requested more regional settings, changes in marketing, tightened guidelines on specific areas of administration, and one suggested merging "a little" with EQUAL.

Overall, this is a highly positive report and, as an evaluator, I have every confidence in saying the high standards of the PA-ARN project are still in place. That this project was singled out for contact by the Harvard School of Education for one of their articles, according to the report from the participants, says that PA-ARN is making a mark on the national scene as well as one the local and state levels.

It is a pleasure to review this type of data and to be associated with such a succesful project making such a difference for literacy in Pennsylvania.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. B. Allan Quigley, Ed.D.
Associate Professor and Chair
Department of Adult Education
St. Francis Xavier University
Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada

IMPACT EVALUATION: SUPERVISORS' INTERVIEW RESPONSE SUMMARY

• Interviews conducted between March 23 and May 5, 1999, one year after the completion of project activities.

• Survey conducted by Debbie Doyle, Administrative Assistant, under the direction of Gary Kuhne, Project Director.

• 10 respondents/16 letter requests

• The 10 survey participants supervised 13 19997/98 PAARN participants

• Projects by Participants under Interviewed Supervisors:

* Changing Administrative Structure to Encourage More Decision-Making and Accountability of Existing Staff
* Noticing Changes in Parenting
* Increasing GED Testing
* Increasing Student-Parent Interaction Time to Improve Student School Studies
* Integration of Technology into Literacy, ESLI and ABE Programs
* Partnering Students to Improve Student Performance
* Part Time Staff Retention
* GED Testing
* Volunteer Recruitment
* Fine Tuning GPLC's Informational Orientation to Increase Retention
* Introducing Computer-Assisted Learning to Work force Literacy Math Classes Adult RIF Program
* Using Flashcards and Audiotaped Words to Increase Literacy Students' Vocabulary - Cycle 2

A. Demographics: Gender: Females - 9 Males - 1

1. During 1997/1998, staff members participating:

   10 supervised 13 participants

2. How long have you been in this supervisory position?

   10.7 years average; Range from 4 years to 25 years.

3. How many teaching staff do you supervise?

   2 supervised area coordinators but no direct teaching staff.
   15 average; Range 7 - 27

4. Do you have a written institutional policy on professional development?

   6 (60%) yes
   4 (40%) no

5. Have you participated in action research training yourself?

3 (30%) yes
7 (70%) no

6. Have you conducted an action research project?

3 (30%) yes
7 (70%) no

B. Professional Development

7. Does your institution have specific written or verbal expectations of how staff should benefit from professional staff development? (If yes) What are they looking for and how do they measure them?

3 (30%) no
7 (70%) yes

- Teachers get information from PDC and decide when to go.
- We instituted 4-5 things teachers would be proficient in; we see how training is incorporated and use a rating scale, assigning numerical numbers.
- People select what they want to do from the skills they need to acquire.
- Staff is told what is coming up and what they need.
- Staff is expected to be able to relate staff development to work and bring back and share with others.
- Immediate application to program, applicable to problems in practice.

8. What are your own supervisor's expectations of how staff should benefit in professional development? How do you measure these and what are you looking for?

- I hope there would be improvement of skills that would transfer to area of expertise in classroom; very difficult to measure, staff development should have real impact on staff performance and student achievement.
- I emphasize that all staff perform in project EQUAL and continuous program improvement; difficult to measure.
- Staff should improve quality of services that they deliver; teaching techniques should improve therefore students benefit from program. I look for application of what was learned in training; I get reports from staff on what they learned and how they plan to use it; I talk with staff and they share with in meetings.
- All adult ed staff need 20 hours of professional development; we set goals at the beginning of year in reference to their needs; I see what pushes them forward in program growth.
- It varies so much from person to person; they should improve some aspect of personal practice.
- If I see something, I invite them to try it; I leave it up to them, I feel I need to do that.
- I want to see implementation into instruction; I want to see those implementations take place.
- I don't expect big or humongus changes, just a little bit - not earth shattering; any little changes or improvements to do better or make easier benefits agency; Sydney's project didn't have direct impact on recruitment, but it really benefited how she does her job.

- All professional development should relate to student performance; our students will receive better instruction and achieve better gains in pre and post test scores; students will attend longer; educational gains will be affected by staff development.
- They will benefit from experience from peers; maintain expectation of change and make changes when necessary; and conduct themselves in a professional manner.

9. When you compare those who have attended traditional workshops to those who have taken action research training, can you see any difference between the benefits received?

3 (30%) yes
5 (50%) hard to say
2 (20%) no

10. Does one type of professional development meet your supervisor's expectations better than the other?

1 (10%) Action Research
3 (30%) State modules
6 (60%) no

C. Action Research

11. Of those who conducted an action research project, whom you personally know, can you think of any particular attitude change which has since resulted from their participation?

1 (10%) hard to answer
2 (20%) no
7 (70%) yes

- Jamie has tremendous attitude towards it; she had focused on several things with research; it opened dikes; it got her thinking in various directions with information.
- Both are more open to looking at things in a questioning framework.
- There is a bigger commitment to program goals; there is more involvement in program at regional and state level; it forced networking with other teachers.
- People have gotten into the habit of using research.
- They're better prepared in their teaching and more thorough; they spend more time thinking their particular job through before jumping in.
- Hard to measure attitude change — subjective; behavior, yes, Action Research showed this individual that maybe some raw data gave them the ability to look objectively.
- They have a sense of the larger picture, because of that they are able to problem-solve better.

12. Have any results of an action research project, made a difference to your institution or to any program at your institution?

8 (80%) yes
1 (10%) no
1 (10%) can't say

13. Has there been an impact on the courses in your institution from action research?

6 (60%) yes
3 (30%) no
1 (10%) can't say

14. Is there any other lasting impact that you can think of?

5 (50%) no
5 (50%) yes

- I hope that it has had a positive impact on the person and that the project would have told them something.
- It has been a positive thing for Jamie and others teachers have expressed interest.
- There is a commitment of staff to ask more questions in practice; last year others were interested in PAIPIN because Action Research made everyone aware; Action Research changed their minds of what training was about.
- The biggest impact is that the whole culture of continuous improvement change.
- It really did develop camaraderie with people who participated. Rich has become very involved with people he participated with; he's quite willing to go places and he's comfortable,

15. Do you have any recommendations to the Action Research Network for the future?

6 (60%) no
4 (40%) yes

- More regional settings.
- Market it differently, we had a really hard time getting people.
- Tighten up guideline, more directed to have impact on job; cost and travel time.
- EQUAL and Action Research can merge a little and will be helpful a bit to most.

IMPACT EVALUATION: PARTICIPANTS' INTERVIEWS

• Interviews were conducted between March 8 and April 12, 1999, one year after the completion of project activities.

• 15 participants responded out of 20 requested (75%).

• Survey was conducted by Debbie Doyle, Project Assistant, under the direction of Gary Kuhne, Project Director.

• Action Research projects of the interviewed participants:

* Changing Administrative Structure to Encourage More Decision—Making and Accountability of Existing Staff
* Newsletter in A Prison Setting
* Noticing Changes in Parenting
* Increasing Student-Parent Interaction Time to Improve Student School Studies
* Integration of Technology into Literacy, ESL, and ABE Programs
* Partnering Students to Improve Student Performance
* The Development of Goal Setting and Planning in GED and ABE Students
* Eliminating Finger Counting in Addition
* GED Testing
* Learner Recruitment
* Volunteer Recruitment
* Fine Tuning GPLC's Informational Orientation to Increase Retention
* Encouraging Students to Engage in a Self- Directed Job Search
* Adult RIF Program
* Using Flashcards and Audiotaped Words to Increase Literacy Students' Vocabulary - Cycle 2

A. Demographics **Gender: Female - 13 (87%) Males — 2 (13%)**

1. Years in literacy field - Teaching/Administration

6.9 years average; Range: from 3 years to 16 years teaching
9 (60%) teaching
1 (7%) administration
5 (33%) in both teaching and administration
15/15 responses

2. Qualifications (educational background)

100% Bachelors
6 (40%) Masters
1 (7%) MEd. Adult Ed
1 (7%) Doctorate

3. In 1996/1997, participants worked in the following settings:

Rural/urban:	9 (60%) urban 5 (33%) rural 1 (7%) suburban
Class Sizes:	6 (40%) 10 or less 5 (33%) greater than 10 5 (33%) one on one tutoring 3 (20%) small group tutoring (3-5)
Size of Agencies:	Range: 50—2000 students

4. Have you taken any other kind of adult education trainingfor example specific courses as adults as learners, and/or teaching and learning processes?

5 (33%) Yes
10 (67%') No
15/15 responses

C. Action Research

5. How did you become aware of The Pennsylvania Action Research Network?

6	(40%)	Director
4	(27%)	Agency
2	(13%)	Allan Quigley
2	(13%)	PDC
2	(13%)	Literature
1	(7%')	Hedy Miller

17/15 responses

6. Before you became involved with Action Research last year,, had you knowledge of former participants or projects?

6	(40%)	Yes
9	(60%')	No

15/15 responses

7. Why did you try action research?

6	(40%)	To explore issues or problems at work
2	(13%)	Sounded interesting
2	(13%)	For the experience
2	(13%)	To achieve goals
1	(7%)	To improve practice
1	(7%)	To provide credibility on issue.
1	(7%)	Assigned to do.
1	(7%)	Something different
1	(7%)	Monetary
1	(7%)	To be published.
1	(7%)	Enjoyed the year before.

19/15 responses

8. Why did you decide not to do an action research project with us this year?

7	(47%)	Time
3	(20%)	No longer in program
2	(13%)	Was not aware PA-ARN was being conducted this year
1	(7%)	My second cycle went well and there was no need to continue it.
1	(7%)	Project EQUAL
1	(7%)	Wanted to do PALPIN
1	(7%)	To give other staff a chance
1	(7%)	Personal problems
1	(7%)	Could not think of anything to do

18/13 responses

9. Why did you decide to do an action research project this year?

- I wanted to take the orientation presentation one step further.
- I really liked it and it was worth doing a second time.

10. What was the best part of conducting action research?

4	(27%)	Networking
4	(27%)	working with students
3	(20%)	Doing research
1	(7%)	Having control
1	(7%)	Action Research is a clearly defined tool
1	(7%)	Developing materials
1	(7%)	Seeing results
1	(7%)	Having a partner
1	(7%)	Finding data
1	(7%)	Relief when it was done

18/15 responses

11. What was the worst part of conducting action research?

5	(33%)	No worst part
5	(33%)	Time and timelines
3	(20%)	Travel
2	(13%)	Writing monograph

15/15 responses

12. What was your project?

* Revising our orientation process.
* Learner recruitment.
* Producing a prison newsletter.
* Looking at how we could get people involved with the research center.
* Volunteer recruitment.
* Increasing the amount of time parents work with children.
* Teaching students goal-setting.
* Eliminating finger-counting.
* Trying an adult RIF (Reading Is Fundamental) Program.
* Developing a way of showing progress with parents developing skills and goal—setting.
* Studying effects of cooperative-learning.

* Determining readiness for taking the GED test.
* Encouraging the use of technology with our literacy students
ESL.
* Empowering staff with decision-making.
* Second cycle — using flashcards and audiotapes to increase vocabulary.

13. What changes, if any, have you made in your classroom, because of your action research?

9 (60%) Made changes
* We are continuing the project.
* Use groups a lot more; use goal—setting activities.
* Using different teaching skills and different assessment tools.
* Now incorporate RIF program.
* More aware of what parents want to see on visit.
* Pair students together.
* Encourage students to take different test indicator.
* During assessment everyone is introduced to technology.
* Continues to use flashcards and audiotapes.

6 (40%) Not Applicable
15/15 responses

14. Have there been any changes in your program, as a result of action research?

10 (67%) Yes
* Changes have been made for inmates to take GED.
* We have adopted some things.
* We have implemented a campaign for regular public service announcements
* The program PASS (Pa Student Success) was adopted and spred to several different areas.
* Focus on doing the basics.
* We can now show progress with survey.
* Presentations at meetings.
* Delegated additional responsibilities to employees
* Staff more motivated and pro—active in decision—making.

5 (33%) No
15/15 responses

15. Have there been any changes in your agency's procedures, a result of action research?

6 (40%) Yes
* We try to keep in touch with learners.
* We adopted the checklist and use it during the intake process.
* We've taken another look at volunteer recruitment.
* We always do a presentation on what was done.
* Our office in Lockhaven has made the procedure standard.
* Staff is more pro—active and help in decision—making; we help more now as part of Project EQUAL.

9 (60%) No
15/15 responses

16. Do you know of others who have used your research outcomes in their work?

2 (13%) Yes
1 (7%) Contacted by Harvard School of Edu tion for an article in one of

their journals.
12 (80%') No
15/15 responses

17. Have you used others' research outcomes in your work?

6 (40%) Yes
* I read so that I would not duplicate.
* I used something in math for awareness.
* Gayle's
* Used someone's study of DADS (Dads Are Doing Something)
* Sue's stuff on orientation we have adopted — adding to handbook, we do a more involved interview.
* Rich makes sure tutors know about use of his strategies;
* Sue Snider's retention and orientation.

9 (60%) No
15/15 responses

18. Have you assisted others in action research through training and/or encouragement, aside from your involvement with PA—ARN?

6 (40%) Yes
9 (60%) No
15/15 responses

19. Would you say you now have better problem solving strategies and look at problems in a more systematic way as a result of action research?

14 (93%) Yes
1 (7%) No
15/15 responses

20. How would you compare the actual job relevance of the action research training with traditional training?

* With AR you do hands-on immediately; you are calling all the shots; you do what you want and can do a second cycle; it is all in your hands.
* AR is a little more precise; a lot more participation. In workshops you go sit and listen; sometimes you don't get involved; it is not hands—on and it is short term. You need to immerse yourself for a longer time with AR.
* AR is smaller, and Hedy Miller is much more relaxed and friendlier than others.
* With AR the benefits are that you put more time and more thought into work; it is a lot more personalized; more ownership. A lot of people can't get to workshops, in AR someone like Linda can come to them.
* AR is more hands—on; you really look at own problem. Workshops are more theory.
* AR is more intensive with more focus.
* AR is superior; I was impressed with Kathy's knowledge and ability to see where you are coming from. AR is presented in dynamic and interesting way. PA—ARN trainers should be spread out to agencies and reassess how staff is trained.
* I got to go deeper with AR; I benefit more because it pertains to my students.
* AR is more relevant to what I do; it reaches into my heart more than someone else's plan.
* AR helped more.

* I liked PA-ARN much better; you design it yourself. Workshops don't apply. You don't waste time with PA-ARN, if you do it's your own fault.
* It is close to the same; it is conducted like workshops.
* AR is more valid, specific to own program; you tailor it yourself; it is more relevant.
* AR is giving you the tools to evaluate problems or situation; you make your own decisions. Workshops has an end in mind, just guiding or providing with tools to a particular thing.
* AR gives you strong tools to use. Workshops may or may not; one training is sometimes not enough; Dr. Cooper — you learn a little here and there, but needs recycled to remember and use it that way.

21. Do you have any suggestions for the Action Research Network?

6	(33%)	No suggestions
9	(67%)	Yes
	*	Access to other projects.
	*	Don't lose Dave.
	*	Get more people involved; research conference.
	*	(2) Better publicity; market Action Research better.
	*	(2) Start sooner.
	*	Closer meetings.
	*	Keep up good work.
	*	Target someone different (due to low response).
	*	Change monograph; monograph is repetitious

17/15 responses

PAARN FIELD EVALUATION 1998-99 COMMENTS

NOTE: 13 participants responded out of 21 requested (62%).

A. ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROJECT:

A. 1. Notification about the project:

- I had ample notification about the project before it began:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1/13	6/13	6/13
		7.7%	46%	46%

- I had a good idea of what this was about when I responded:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1/13	1/13	8/13	3/13
	7.7%	7.7%	62%	23%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

A.2 Training in Action Research:

* I was satisfied with the training on how to conduct action research:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		2/13	4/13	7/13
		15%	31%	54%

*I was satisfied with how the trainer conducted the training session(s) for our group:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1/13	5/13	7/13
		7.7%	54%	54%

* The Handbook and Planner helped me:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1/11	2/11	8/11
		8%	18%	73%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

A.3 Support During the Project:

* 1 was satisfied with the support from my project leader while I was conducting my research project:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
			6/13	7/13
			46%	54%

- 1 was satisfied with the collaboration I got from the other members of the group:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1/13	7/13	5/13
		8%	54%	38%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

A.4 Administrative Suggestions For The Future?

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

B. ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL ACTION RESEARCH PROJECTS:

B.1 Process of Action Research Itself:

- Action research is a valuable way to resolve practice problems:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1/13	1/13	3/13	8/13
	8%	8%	23%	62%

- Action research is a valuable way to add new knowledge to the field:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1/13		4/13	8/13
	8%		31%	62%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

B.2 Outcomes of Your Research Project:

* The process of dealing with a problem through action research was helpful in itself:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1/13	4/13	8/13
		8%	31%	62%

* The outcomes of my project were helpful to my work:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
			5/13	8/13
			38%	62%

* Compared to most of the professional development workshops offered in my region, I believe this is the best way to invest my time:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1/13	4/13	4/13	4/13
	8%	31%	31%	31%

* I will consider using the data I have collected in future grant writing:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1/13	1/13	6/13	3/13	2/13
8%	8%	46%	23%	23%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

B.3 Significance of the Outcomes:

*The results of my study have resolved the problems identified:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1/13	3/13	5/13	4/13
	8%	23%	38%	31%

*1 will/already have begun another cycle of investigation on this or another topic:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1/12	1/12	4/12	5/12	1/12
8%	8%	33%	42%	8%

*1 will/have begun another cycle of investigation on this or another topic and will pursue it without an honorarium if necessary:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
2/13	1/13	3/13	5/13	2/13
15%	8%	23%	38%	15%

*1 will/already have shared the outcomes with my co-workers in addition to the monograph:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1/12	2/12	5/12	4/12
	8%	17%	42%	35%

*1 will/I intend to present the outcomes of my project at a professional meeting in the future (e.g., PAACE, in-region meeting, etc.)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1/12	4/12	4/12	3/12	
8%	33%	33%	25%	

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

C. EFFECTS OF THIS PROCESS ON YOUR OWN WORK:

C.1 Perceiving Problems in Practice:

*I can now identify the types of problems I encounter on the job more clearly:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		4/13	4/13	5/13
		31%	31%	38%

*I believe I can take better, more systematic steps to deal with problems I encounter on the job and will do so with action research:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		4/12	2/12	6/12
		33%	17%	50%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

C.2 Taking Steps to Effect Change:

* I now have greater confidence that I can undertake effective steps to resolve problems I identify on the job using action research:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1/13		2/13	3/13	7/13
8%		15%	23%	54%

*I now have the confidence to help others take such steps:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1/13	2/13	6/13	4/13
	8%	15%	46%	31%

*I will/am already working to bring about changes beyond my immediate work, in my program more generally, as a result of this project:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		3/13	8/13	2/13
		23%	66%	15%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

C.3 My Role With Other Practitioners:

*I believe my role among the others with whom I work has changed as a result of this project:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	2/13	6/13	4/13	1/13
	15%	46%	31%	8%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

D. PERCEPTION OF SELF:

*I believe my perception of myself as a practitioner has changed:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree-	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1/13		5/13	3/13	4/13
8%		38%	23%	31%

***Comments? Please refer to attached comment pages.**

E. OVERALL

*Looking back, some of the things I liked best were:

***For comments, please refer to attached comment pages.**

*Looking back, some of the things I liked least were:

***For comments, please refer to attached comment pages.**

F. SUGGESTIONS

*If this project goes next year, my suggestions are:

*** For comments, please refer to attached comment pages.**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS PAGES:

A.1. Notification about the Project:

* This was my second year of PA—ARN so I knew about it well in advance.
* I had an advantage working with both the PDC and Hedy being in our office.
* I'm sure more time would have helped me think things through.

A.2. Training In Action Research

* The planner should have included a couple of past monographs as examples.
* The planner was tremendous this year. It was easier to follow and very user friendly. I like being able to refer back to the Handbook - very useful.
* The accommodations for my deafness were good. Pacing of the presentations and dialogue with other participants was slow enough to accommodate interpreting.
* The planner is a big help in organizing your thoughts and giving some direction to the project.
* It terrified me to see the Planner until I had the opportunity to absorb it.

A.3 Support of the Project:

* David is very encouraging.
* The meeting of the group members is a crucial step in PA-ARN. It helps you to flush out your project, determine weaknesses and learn about other practitioners. I feel this is a strength of PA—ARN which will be lost if eliminated.

* I don't want the previous statement misconstrued (referring to an "agree" answer to "I was satisfied with the collaboration I got from the other members of the group"). Around Christmas Hedy broke us up into "buddies" so we could help and report to each other. This was very useful. I also found feedback from others useful but because of my PDC commitments I could not attend every single meeting, so I missed some of that sharing time.
* I found the group meetings a bit of a waste of time, were not the same as the groups.

A.4 Administrative suggestions for the future:

* Nothing. It was great to start earlier this year. I didn't feel rushed. I had more time to preplan and execute my project.
* Shorter timeframe.

B.1 Process of Action Research itself.

* I feel AR is such a valuable tool because it helps resolve problems that are here and now. It also allows practitioners to participate who might not have considered doing "research".
* The info needs to be dispersed beyond just making a book.
* I certainly learned a lot and began to change some techniques. I worked closely with a colleague and she became aware of things we needed to do to improve.
* It is a great way to implement a change you have been contemplating and see if it really works. It is also empowering to the practitioner because you get to see your ideas implemented.
* It has also lessened my fear of research.
* The structure of action research was very useful as we tried a new teaching methodology.

B.2 Outcomes of your research project:

* I do think I learned a lot personally from learning the Action Research process.
* My project would not be related to grants.
* I want to test some observations further.
* As part of the PDC, I cannot say this was "the best way to invest my time" (Referring to previous statement: "Compared to most of the professional development workshops in my region, I believe this is the best way to invest my time.") It was a great way but other professional development opportunities have advanced my practice in different ways. This was one way to broaden my horizons.

B.3 Significance of the Outcomes:

* In process.
* The results of my study is working for the present but depends on the staff of my program if it will continue in the future.
* The research we did was helpful but it needs to be replicated with some changes. So our problem statement wasn't solved but we do have a more complete instructional methodology as a result of the project.
* I have learned a lot and also learned that students can share as well.
* I am continuing to contact students who no longer attend class and have not met their goals.
* Whenever I notice practitioners discussing orientation, I always speak about my project. Being a part of the PDC, I have more opportunity than others because I come in contact with more programs I don't know how interested a professional. I don't know how interested a professional meeting's people would be in my project.

C.1 Perceiving problems in Practice:

* I really consider any technique or any problem with a different view now. Cheers for the project.

* This was a by—product of our efforts, the clear well organized Action Research model used, and listening to other practitioners.

C.2 Taking steps to effect change:

* Working with my program improvement team has helped me to bring about other changes which may be directly related to my project I'm more aware of changes that can be made now.
* We get "selected" to serve on committees so I'm not sure what I'll be allowed to do.
* This action research was part of other efforts to implement a new instructional methodology.

C.3 My role with other practitioners:

* Role really hasn't changed.
* I certainly had wonderful suggestions and feedback from the team.
* I already was involved in action research so my role has not changed. Working relationships have been enhanced since this project was a cooperative effort.

D. "PERCEPTIONS OF SELF" comments:

* Time is always such an important and elusive factor. I always wish I had more time to develop my projects to do another cycle, but more and more that becomes impossible.
* I was hesitant at first but really became involved in the project.
* My confidence level rose.

K. Looking back, some of the things I liked best were:

* Validating what I already knew to be true.
* Having a different type of communication with my students. Gathering a variety of information.
* Interacting with other practitioners and listening to how their projects evolve. Working with Hedy. She's so pleasant and knowledgeable.
* Making time to pursue questions.
* E—mail correspondence.
* I liked the changed format for the final paper. It was less rigid and less redundant from the previous format.
* I liked the group meetings and the sharing of ideas.
* Examining the results of my research.
* Results.
* The discussions with other practitioners. Because each was dealing with a problem and the forum permitted open disclosure of issues faced and processes used it was instructive and as fertile ground for development of more ideas.
* Interacting by communication with past, present, and future tutors in our program.
* Collaborating with others in similar programs.
* The opportunity to discuss my project with others and to share with those conducting action research.

K.1. Looking back, some of the things I like the least were:

* That participants didn't cooperate as I had hoped - but that would have made my action research unnecessary.
* How time consuming the project was.
* Making handbook for my project.
* I felt the project needed to run for a longer period of time.
* The group meetings.

* Having to choose between going to a PAARN meeting or going to another obligation.
* Having Hedy tell us she's leaving.
* Forgetting to tape our discussions. Feeling rushed because of so many things going on.
* Typo's - Being unsuccessful at finding mistakes.

F. SUGGESTIONS:

* Start early and make sure the leader is someone like Dave Fetterman
* Try to do something about the type of computer allowed.
* Disseminate information. We can't get enough helpful advice from colleagues.
* For the final project - have more than one reader so that one person doesn't have to do all the corrections, etc. Dividing up the readings would be easier.
* One on one meetings with adviser rather than large group.
* Continue with the facilitation groups, the sharing of ideas is invaluable. Keep the format for the final paper.
* Have sessions for phase two people. For our issue a multi—year treatment study needs to be done. So multi-year longitudinal planning is useful.

APPENDIX C: REVISIONS

- REVISIONS TO ACTION RESEARCH PLANNER
- REVISIONS TO THE MONOGRAPH GUIDE

ACTION RESEARCH PLANNER

Name_____
Proposed Title_____
_____
Phone Number_____
Address_____
_____
Program Address_____Region_____
Proposed Start Date_____
Proposed Completion Date_____

A. *Problem Phase:*

1. Where do you work? Are you in an ESL, ABE, or GED program, in a rural or urban setting?

2. What is the problem? Provide background to the problem.

3. What are the most obvious reasons for/causes of the problem?

Problem Phase, Continued:

4. **In what specific ways would your program or classroom be improved, if this problem were resolved?**

5. **What is the significance of the problem and its solution to your job situation?**

B. *Planning Phase:*

1. Describe the *proposed* intervention you want to try. (Refer to p. 11 in Handbook.)

2. When will you begin? What is the timeline for the project? (Refer to p. 12 in Handbook.)

3. What materials/equipment/support will you need? Why?

Planning Phase, Continued:

4. Specify the **methods** to be used to collect the data. (Refer to p. 12 and Appendix A in Handbook.)

5. Specify the **baseline** to be used as a point of comparison. (Refer to pp. 11-12 in Handbook.)

6. Specify the **criteria for success** to be evaluated against. Describe reasons for these criteria. How will you know that it succeeded? (Refer to p. 12 in Handbook.)

Planning Phase, Continued:

7. What are the likely constraints, once you get started?

8. Can you prevent or overcome these constraints? How?

9. Whose approval(s) will you need to conduct research within your institution?

10. How will you get consent from the participants for this research. Do you need written or verbal consent? (Refer to p. 13 in Handbook.)

Planning Phase, Continued:

11. Which colleagues will discuss and evaluate your work?

12. What current literature addresses this problem? Does it make sense to implement this project with the literature results in mind?

13. What exactly IS the problem statement? Include: problem, intervention, context, criteria for success and timeframe. Example: Will the implementation of a buddy-system improve attendance in an urban ESL classroom by at least 20% over a 10 week period?

C. *Action Phase:*

Provide a *summary* of the data collected discussing results and interpretation.

D. *Results:*

Provide a *summary* of the reflection outcomes following the planning phase and the action phase.

E. ***Reflection Phase:***

Will you enter a second cycle of the project? If not, discuss why not. What would you do differently?

ACTION RESEARCH

MONOGRAPH

Pennsylvania Action Research Network

A Section 353 Project
of the
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education

Monograph Title:_____

Action Researcher's Name:_____

Date:_____

Program Address:_____

Region:_____

A *Learning from Practice* Special Project

MONOGRAPH GUIDE

Abstract:

- Problem statement
- Population (ESL, ABE, GED, etc.)
- Brief baseline
- Intervention (1-2 sentences)
- Data collecting strategies
- Brief results

Recommended: 1/2 page

A. Problem:

- Context of work site (urban/rural, size, clientele, your role)
- Cause(s) of problem
- Background to problem
- What effect improvement would have on your agency.
- Significance to your practice.

Recommended: 1 page

B. Planning:

- Intervention plan
- Time frame
- Materials
- Data collecting strategies
- Baseline
- Criteria for success
- Constraints
- Approval
- Current literature and recommendations.
- End with the problem statement, for example: "Will the implementation of a buddy system improve attendance in an urban ESL classroom of at least 20% over a 10-week period?"

Recommended: 1-2 pages

C. Action:

- Provide more detail into the steps of the intervention.
- Time line
- Materials
- Constraints
- Problems.

Recommended: 1-2 pages

D. Results:

- Summary of data
- Interpretation of project
- Success or failure and why
- Impact
- Detailed outcomes

Recommended: 1-2 pages

E. Reflection:

- Impact of results on your problem.
- Why did things turn out this way?
- What would you do differently?
- Plans for future project
- General reflection

Recommended: 1 page

Appendix:

You may include additional information (charts, questionnaires, forms, etc).

- Do not include copyrighted material.
- Use one side of the paper only.
- Do not use colored paper.
- Do not use staples.

Monograph Specifications:

Diskette:

- Must be PC formatted. Not Macintosh.
- Use a new diskette, not a re-formatted disc.

Program:

- Use WordPerfect (any version) or if in Word, Lotus 123, etc. save as ASCII DOS text format.

Style:

- Do not number pages.
- Use *Times New Roman* Font.
- Use size 12 font.
- Do not use special outline formatting.